UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,902	07/17/2003	David Yu Chang	AUS920030082US1	2139

65362 7590 01/10/2007	EXAMINER
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION	CAO, PHUONG THAO
c/o HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP	

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 203518	2164	
AUSTIN, TX 78720		

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/621,902	CHANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 November 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-9,11-17 and 19-24* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to Amendment filed along with the Petition for Revival on

11/15/2006.

2.   Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended, and claims 2, 10 and 18 have been cancelled.

Currently, claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

4.   Regarding the "Cross-Reference to Related Applications" section, the Applicant is not

allowed to include private information such as Attorney Docket Number which should be taken

out of the Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6.   Claim 17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention.

Claim 17 contains "tangible computer-readable medium" which is considered as new

subject matter since it is not defined in the Specification.

Claims 19-24 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 17 upon which they

depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions
and requirements of this title.

8.   Claims 1, 3-8, 9, 11-16, 17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the

claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 1, 9 and 17, these claims recite the process of processing names by a naming service within a data processing system, but fail to recite a tangible result.

For a result to be tangible, it must be more than just a thought or a computation; it must have real-world value rather than an abstract result. To provide some practical application, the result data must be displayed to a user or stored in some suitable medium for later retrieval and use.

Claims 3-8, 11-16 and 19-24 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claims 1, 9 and 17 upon which they depend respectively.

Regarding claim 17, the "computer-readable medium" is not limited to tangible media in accordance with Applicant's specification (see page 30), which states that it may be digital or analog communication link, not in and of itself a tangible medium. Simply adding "tangible" to the "computer-readable medium" does not make the claimed medium tangible. The "tangible computer-readable medium" should be replaced by "computer storage medium" to overcome this rejection.

Claims 19-24 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 17 upon which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming
> the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10.   Claims 7, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "previously bound data object" in lines 2. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed that this claim depends

on claim 5 and treated as such in this action. However, appropriate correction is required.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "previously bound data object" in line 2. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed that this claim depends

on claim 13 and treated as such in this action. However, appropriate correction is required.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "previously bound data object" in lines 2. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed that this claim depends

on claim 21 and treated as such in this action. However, appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12.   Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Lango et al. (US Patent No 6,813,690).

As to claim 1, Lango et al. teaches:

"A method for processing names by a naming service within a data processing system" (see

Abstract and Fig. 6), the method comprising:

"obtaining an application name that is associated with an application" (see [column 9,

lines 20-60] wherein media data is equivalent to Applicant's "application" and URL associated

with the media data is equivalent to Applicant's "application name"; also see [column 1, lines

65-67] and [column 2, lines 1-5]);

"obtaining a deployment name that is associated with a deployment attribute that

characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application" (see [column 9, lines 32-45],

[column 5, lines 25-30], [column 10, lines 50] wherein information related to various attributes

and properties of the medium is equivalent to Applicant's "deployment name"; also see [column

6, lines 1-5] wherein each version of media data is equivalent to Applicant's "instance of the application"); and

"generating an application-based name for the instance of the application, wherein the application-based name represents a context within a naming system, and wherein the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the deployment name" (see [column 12, lines 10-67] and [column 16, lines 1-25] wherein object name string is equivalent to Applicant's "application-based name"; also see [column 19, lines 7-55]); and

"wherein a deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system" (see [column 12, lines 40-50 and 57-65], [column 13, lines 1-25] and [column 19, lines 35-55]).

As to claim 9, Lango et al. teaches:

"An apparatus for processing names by a naming service within a data processing system" (see Abstract and Fig. 6), the apparatus comprising:

"means for obtaining an application name that is associated with an application" (see [column 9, lines 20-60] wherein media data is equivalent to Applicant's "application" and URL associated with the media data is equivalent to Applicant's "application name"; also see [column 1, lines 65-67] and [column 2, lines 1-5]);

"means for obtaining a deployment name that is associated with a deployment attribute that characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application" (see [column 9, lines 32-45], [column 5, lines 25-30], [column 10, lines 50] wherein information related to various attributes

and properties of the medium is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "deployment name"; also see [column

6, lines 1-5] wherein each version of media data is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "instance of the

application"); and

"means for generating an application-based name for the instance of the application,

wherein the application-based name represents a context within a naming system, and wherein

the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the

deployment name" (see [column 12, lines 10-67] and [column 16, lines 1-25] wherein object

name string is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "application-based name"; also see [column 19, lines 7-

55]); and

"wherein a deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which

the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system" (see [column 12,

lines 40-50 and 57-65], [column 13, lines 1-25] and [column 19, lines 35-55]).

As to claim 17, <u>Lango et al.</u> teaches:

"A computer program product in a tangible computer-readable medium for use in a data

processing system for processing names by a naming service" (see Abstract and Fig. 6), the

computer program product comprising:

"means for obtaining an application name that is associated with an application" (see

[column 9, lines 20-60] wherein media data is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "application" and URL

associated with the media data is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "application name"; also see [column

1, lines 65-67] and [column 2, lines 1-5]);

"means for obtaining a deployment name that is associated with a deployment attribute

that characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application" (see [column 9, lines 32-45],

[column 5, lines 25-30], [column 10, lines 50] wherein information related to various attributes

and properties of the medium is equivalent to Applicant's "deployment name"; also see [column

6, lines 1-5] wherein each version of media data is equivalent to Applicant's "instance of the

application"); and

"means for generating an application-based name for the instance of the application,

wherein the application-based name represents a context within a naming system, and wherein

the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the

deployment name" (see [column 12, lines 10-67] and [column 16, lines 1-25] wherein object

name string is equivalent to Applicant's "application-based name"; also see [column 19, lines 7-

55]); and

"wherein a deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which

the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system" (see [column 12,

lines 40-50 and 57-65], [column 13, lines 1-25] and [column 19, lines 35-55]).

As to claims 3, 11 and 19, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for

rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

"wherein the application-based name comprises the application name and multiple

deployment names associated with multiple deployment attributes" (see [column 19, lines 40-45]

wherein URL is application name and English/MSIE are multiple deployment names associated

with multiple deployment attributes such as language/browser type).

As to claims 4, 12 and 20, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for

rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

"wherein a deployment attribute is selected from the group comprising" (see [column 19,

lines 20-55] for metadata is equivalent to Applicant's "deployment attribute"):

"a deployment identifier, wherein a deployment identifier is a unique identifier associated

with the deployment operation, wherein the deployment identifier is unique over all deployment

operations for all instances of the application within the data processing system;

a version identifier or an edition identifier associated with a version of the application;

or some other identifier for a deployment-associated characteristic or metric" (see

[column 10, lines 1-30], [column 13. lines 1-25], [column 15, lines 30-40] and [column 19, lines

7-55]).

As to claims 5, 13 and 21, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for

rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

"binding the application-based name to a data object" (see Fig. 3 and [column 6, lines 25-

40].

As to claims 6, 14 and 22, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 5, 13 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

"relating the data object to a context for an application server" (see Fig. 5 and [column 6, lines 15-25] wherein caching server is equivalent to Applicant's "application server" and object handle is equivalent to Applicant's "context").

As to claims 7, 15 and 23, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 5, 13 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

"resolving the application-based name to a previously bound data object" (Fig. 6, [column 6, lines 15-25] and [column13, lines 50-67]).

As to claims 8, 16 and 24, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

"wherein an application comprises a plurality of application modules wherein each module is associated with a module name and wherein each module is associated with an application-based name based on its module name" (see [column 11, lines 15-65] and [column 12, lines 10-25] wherein each object of the media data is equivalent to Applicant's "application module" and object number is equivalent to Applicant's "module name"; also see Fig. 4).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

January 5, 2007

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER